Serial No.: 09/506,767

REMARKS

In the Office Action that was mailed on September 15, 2005, claims 1-29 and 31-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Chandra, Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji, Kay, Larson, Bach, McFiggins, Gu, Gabbler, Mann, Evans, Ganesan, and DeRoest; and claim 30 is allowed. The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-51 are pending in the subject application, of which claims 1, 16, 17, 23, 24, 30, 31, and 47-51 are independent claims.

Amendments to the Claims:

Independent claims 47-51 are canceled herein. Claims 1-5, 16-19, 23-27, and 41-44 are amended herein to recite "preexisting" word elements and at least one "preexisting" list of word elements. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the Specification.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Applicants thank the examiner for indicating that claim 30 is allowable.

Rejections of the Claims:

Independent Claim 31:

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Ganesan does not generate words that are used to identify a user. Ganesan discusses receiving a request to generate a random security password. (Ganesan, col. 22, line 8). Security passwords are understood in the art to be used for authentication of a user, not for identification of the user. The random security passwords in Ganesan are not relevant to claim 31, which recites a request to generate an account name.

In addition, Nesbitt <u>only</u> works with a <u>requested</u> account name to suggest an alternative account name. However, claim 31 does not recite receiving any requested account name from a user. In fact, claim 31 specifically recites that <u>no</u> "input or suggestion of names from the user" is used in providing alternate unique account names. Clearly, Nesbitt is not relevant to the subject matter of claim 31 because Nesbitt

Serial No.: 09/506,767

requires a requested account name and does not suggest any other method of generating account names without receiving a requested account name first.

Independent claim 31 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and the Applicants respectfully request that the examiner indicate that the same is allowable.

Independent Claims 1, 16, 17, 23, and 24:

Independent claims 1, 16, 17, 23, and 24 are amended herein to recite "preexisting" word elements and at least one "preexisting" list of word elements.

Nesbitt is cited against all of the independent claims; however, Nesbitt only suggests substitutes based solely on the requested user name. In the example in Nesbitt, if the user requests "scottnesbitt," the system suggests only names that are formed entirely from the requested user name, e.g., "snesbitt" and "scottn." Nesbitt does <u>not</u> use any preexisting word elements, nor does Nesbitt draw from a preexisting list of word elements. Because the requested user name in Nesbitt is not known before it is received, it cannot be preexisting.

Clearly, independent claims 1, 16, 17, 23, and 24 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-15, 18-22, 25-29, and 32-46 are allowable based in part on their dependency from one of independent claims 1, 16, 17, 23, and 24.

Independent Claims 47-51:

Independent claims 47-51 are canceled herein.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If

Serial No.: 09/506,767

there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Q. Ammon

Reg. No. 50,346

MQA/wkk SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. 2555 Grand Blvd. Kansas City, MO 64108-2613 816-474-6550